

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1, 3-9, 12-16, 18-24, and 27-35 were pending in the application when the Final Office Action was mailed March 4, 2009. Claims 1, 3-9, 16, 18-24 and 31-35 were rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 18, 23, 24, and 31; canceled claims 4, 5, 19, 20, and 32; and added new claims 36 and 37. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 6-9, 12-16, 21-24, 27-31, and 33-37 are currently pending, with claims 12-15 and 27-30 being withdrawn. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, 16, 18-24 and 31-35. More specifically, claims 1, 3-9, 16, 18-24 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Iverson, Lee, "NODAL: A Filesystem for Ubiquitous Collaboration" ("NODAL") and Armstrong, Eric, "[unrev-II] Meeting Summary: 4 May 2000" (referred to as "Iverson" in the Office Action and herein).

II. Response to the § 103(a) Rejections of Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 16, 18, 21-24, 31, and 33-35

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 16, 18, 21-24, 31, and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of NODAL and Iverson. Although the applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, in order to advance prosecution, the applicants have elected to amend independent claims 1, 16, and 31 to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at paragraph [0083] (describing registering event handlers), paragraph [0073] (describing monitoring events), and paragraph [00128] (describing responding to events) of applicants' specification, as well as Figures 16-18 (illustrating multiple event handlers and responding to mutations). Based on the claim amendments above and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that this Section 103 rejection is now overcome.

The Office Action states that the Cursor in NODAL corresponds to the business logic event handler as recited in the claims, pointing to NODAL at pages 20, 21, 26, and 27. (Office Action, page 3.) Although the applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation, the applicants have further amended the independent claims to further distinguish the claimed subject matter over NODAL and Iverson. The applicants include the following table which contains examples of differences between the subject matter of claim 1 and NODAL:

Features of Claim 1	Difference between features and NODAL
"the first business logic event handler is registered for a hierarchical document of the distributed document object model system" "the second business logic event handler is registered for the hierarchical document of the distributed document object model system, wherein the second business logic event handler is different from the first business logic event handler"	NODAL describes only a <u>single</u> Cursor for accessing data mutation interfaces on page 20. In other words, there would be only a <u>single</u> Cursor for accessing a document in NODAL's system. A Cursor is nothing like a business logic event handler. Moreover, claim 1 now recites first and second business logic event handlers registered for the same hierarchical document and that are different from each other.
"the first business logic event handler is responsive to an occurrence of the first event of the distributed document object model system" "the second business logic event handler is responsive to an	NODAL describes events related to files such as creation, modification, and access on page 20. However, NODAL does not teach or suggest event handlers that are responsive to occurrences of these or any other events.

Features of Claim 1	Difference between features and NODAL
occurrence of the second event of the distributed document object model system"	
"registering the first business logic event handler for the first event of the distributed document object model system" "registering the second business logic handler for the second event of the distributed document object model system" "the second event is different from the first event"	NODAL does not describe registering event handlers. According to the Office Action, NODAL's Cursor is inherently registered. (Office Action, pages 3 and 4.) Even if NODAL's Cursor is registered, there is no teaching or suggestion that it is an event handler. Moreover, NODAL still does not teach or suggest two different event handlers, each registered for a different event.
"monitoring for an occurrence of at least one of the first and second events" "detecting an occurrence of the first event"	NODAL does not teach or suggest monitoring for events and detecting the occurrence of events.

As can be seen from the above examples, NODAL's Cursor does not correspond to the business logic event handler as recited in claim 1. Indeed, nowhere in NODAL are the above features taught or suggested. The Office Action does not suggest that

Iverson cures NODAL's deficiencies with respect to the above features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over NODAL and Iverson, either alone or in combination. Independent claims 16 and 31 recite features generally similar to those recited in claim 1, and are thus allowable for similar reasons. Claims 3, 6-9, 12-15, 18, 21-24, and 33-35 depend from allowable independent claims and are thus likewise allowable. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6-9, 16, 18, 21-24, 31, and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

The claims each recite a novel combination of elements that is neither taught nor suggested by the applied references and so cannot be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 or 103.

Based on these amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request early allowance of this application. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6065.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 612188007US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

9/4/09

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph F. Brennan

Registration No.: 62,403

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant